



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/638,192	08/15/2000	Ivan A. Cowie	28549-165559	1610	
26694 7	7590 04/13/2004		EXAMINER		
,	BAETJER, HOWARI	MUNOZ, GUILLERMO			
P.O. BOX 343	85 N. DC 20043-9998	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Wildim 6161, 56 20013 7770			2634	Λ.	
			DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004	21	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

&

					201		
		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/638,19)2	COWIE ET AL.			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Guillermo		2634			
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	n appears on the	cover sheet w	ith the correspondence add	iress		
THE M - Extensing after SI - If the pure if NO pure if Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicative eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by oly received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event on. , a reply within the state period will apply and wi statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a r story minimum of thir Il expire SIX (6) MON lication to become AE	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely ITHS from the mailing date of this col BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
2a)⊠ T 3)□ S	This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.						
Dispositio	n of Claims						
4. 5)□ 0 6)図 0 7)図 0	Claim(s) 1,6-11,17-19,22-24,26,31-36,42-44 and 47-49 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 12-16,20,25,37-41,45 and 50 is/are objected to.						
Applicatio	n Papers						
10)□ Ti	he specification is objected to by the Exame the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) splicant may not request that any objection the caplacement drawing sheet(s) including the captacement or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) o the drawing(s) borrection is require	e held in abeyared if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CF	` '		
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) 1 2 3	cknowledgment is made of a claim for fo All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority docu Certified copies of the priority docu Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bee the attached detailed Office action for	ments have bee ments have bee e priority docume ureau (PCT Rul	n received. n received in A ents have been e 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National \$	Stage		
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔯 Informa	s) of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO 	-152)		

Application/Control Number: 09/638,192

Art Unit: 2634

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6-20, 22-26, and 31-45, 47-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 6-11, 17-19, 22-24, 26, 31-36, 42-44, and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki et al. (US 6,212,230 B1) in view of McCorkle et al. (US 2003/0053555 A1) and in further view of Cassia et al. (US 5,987,068).

Regarding claims 1 and 26, Rybicki et al. disclose a Pulse Position Modulation Method and Apparatus which teaches all the claimed subject matter, note figures 1, 2, and 4, col. 5, line 20 to col. 6, line 60, and col. 7, line 24 to col. 8, line 3. Rybicki et al. teach a code generator which can have at least two code element values, as illustrated in figure 4. Further, Rybicki et al. teach associating an amplitude pulse characteristic with the generated code, note column 6, lines 13-35; associating a pulse width with a generated code in Col. 14, lines 16-25; except their code generator does not contain polarity characteristics.

Application/Control Number: 09/638,192

Art Unit: 2634

McCorkle et al. teach the use of inverted or non-inverted copies of coded data for the purpose of communicating information in a pulse position modulation system (page 1, paragraph 0010).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rybicki et al.'s impulse communication system with McCorkle et al.'s teaching of using inverted or non-inverted copies of coded information, since McCorkle et al. suggest on page 3, paragraph 0047 that the result of this modulation would help to generate larger collections of codes.

Cassia et al. teach the use of orthogonal pulse shapes for the purpose of transmitting supplemental data-over-a-frequency channel, note Col. 3, lines 22-23, Col. 6, lines 15-17. Cassia et al. do not explicitly recite "Channelization", however, the function of transmitting two or more signals over a single frequency using orthogonal pulse shapes to reduce the amount of interfering between the signals is the same.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the pulse shapes taught by Rybicki et al. and McCorkle et al. with Cassia et al.'s teaching of using orthogonal pulse shapes, since Cassia et al. suggest on Col. 3, line 5 that the result of this modification would enhance the communication capability.

Regarding claims 6 and 31, Rybicki et al. further teach the claimed subject matter "code element...pulse characteristic" in figure 4.

Regarding claims 7 and 32, see claim 6 above.

Regarding claims 8 and 33, Rybicki et al. further teach the claimed subject matter "code element...comprises an integer" in figure 4.

Application/Control Number: 09/638,192

Art Unit: 2634

Regarding claims 9, 10, 34 and 35, Rybicki et al. further teach the claimed subject matter "code element values indicate...range of non-temporal pulse characteristic values" in figures 4, 13 and 26.

Regarding claims 11 and 36, McCorkle et al. further teach the claimed subject matter in page 4, paragraph 0071.

Regarding claims 17-19 and 42-44, Rybicki et al. further teaches the value of pulse characteristic is specified within a value component, note figure 4.

Regarding claims 21 and 46, see claim 4.

Regarding claims 23 and 48, Rybicki et al. teach the claimed subject matter "code element...pulse characteristic values" in table listed in columns 8-12.

Regarding claims 24 and 49, Rybicki et al. further teach the claimed subject matter "each code element value...pulse characteristic values" in Col. 7, lines 30-46 or Col.24, lines 43-56.

Claim Objections

Claims 12-16, 20, 25, 37-41, 45, and 50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Guillermo Munoz whose telephone number is 703-305-4224. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30a.m-4:30p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Chin can be reached on 703-305-4714. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GM

April 7, 2004

sullerus Maning

STEPHEN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600